



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,140	11/27/2006	Mette Brink	00660.0322-US-WO	3142
22865	7590	07/22/2008		
Altera Law Group, LLC 220 S 6 St Suite 1700 Minneapolis, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
HSIEH, PING Y				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2618				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/22/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/573,140

Applicant(s)

BRINK ET AL.

Examiner

PING Y. HSIEH

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 May 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 March 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cannon et al. (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2002/0090912).

-Regarding claim 1, Cannon et al. disclose a communications unit **(BLUETOOTH device 100, fig. 1)** constructed as a slave station which is adapted to be coupled to a plurality of master stations via a wireless connection **(as disclosed in paragraph 23)**, said communications unit having a memory with a plurality of address fields in which one or more identification keys may be stored **(BD_ADDR device address 502 as disclosed in fig. 1 and further disclosed in paragraph 36-37))**, wherein a coupling is established between one of the master stations and the communications unit in that an identification key of the master station is stored in one of the address fields of the communications unit **(pairing of BLUETOOTH devices occurs by setting up which BLUETOOTH device addresses can establish a connection with each other as disclosed in paragraph 37)**, wherein at least one of the address fields of the communications unit is configured with a fixed address field and an associated electrical lock **(passcode or pin as disclosed in paragraph 37)**, and that the

address field may be overwritten only if a certain master station of the plurality of master stations has a unique identification key to open the electrical lock **(as disclosed in paragraph 37 and 38)** on a request from communications unit **(the requesting BLUETOOTH device receives and validates the associated passcodes or PINS as disclosed in paragraph 47)**.

-Regarding claim 2, Cannon et al. further disclose the fixed address field is predefined to be coupled only to specific master stations **(as disclosed in paragraph 37-38)**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon et al. (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2002/0090912).

-Regarding claim 3, Cannon et al. disclose all the limitations as claimed in claim 1. Cannon et al. further disclose the communication unit stores addresses of master stations within range **(as disclosed in paragraph 41)**, except that one field is locked against being over written unless supplied with an unlock code **(the communications would not be permitted between devices not having a same PIN as disclosed in paragraph 59)**. Although Cannon et al. do not specifically disclose overwriting the address fields with new address after a

predetermined maximum number of address fields is filled, the examiner takes official notice that overwriting old data in a memory was well known in the art and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement in a storage means. This modification would have been prompted because it would reduce the size of the memory and save money.

5. Claims 4, 5, 7, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon et al. (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2002/0090912) in view of Liang (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2002/0071549).

-Regarding claim 4, Cannon et al. disclose all the limitations as claimed in claim 1. However, Cannon et al. fail to specifically disclose the BLUETOOTH device 100 is a headset.

Liang discloses a wireless headset 40 as disclosed in fig. 1 and paragraph 14.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the BLUETOOTH device as disclosed by Cannon et al. to be a wireless headset as disclosed by Liang. One is motivated as such in order to provide an easier way to pick up a telephone when the user is using both hands for other operations.

-Regarding claim 5, the combination further discloses the master station is an adapter master station having a unique identification key, and that the adapter

master station is coupled, optionally wirelessly, to a public switched telephone
(Liang, as disclosed in paragraph 14).

-Regarding claim 7, the combination further discloses the master station is
a public switched telephone **(Liang, as disclosed in paragraph 14).**

-Regarding claim 9, the combination further discloses the adapter master
station has an electrical circuit or a mechanical structure adapted to lift or hang-
up the receiver of the public switched telephone **(Liang, handset raising device
30 as disclosed in fig. 1 and paragraph 14).**

-Regarding claim 11, the combination further discloses the adapter master
station has a charging unit to charge the headset **(Liang, receiving/charging
slot 23 as disclosed in fig. 1 paragraph 18).**

6. Claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Cannon et al. (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2002/0090912) in view of Liang (U.S. PG-PUB NO.
2002/0071549) and further in view of Mooncy et al. (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2003/0045235).

-Regarding claims 6 and 10, the combination of Cannon et al. and Liang
discloses all the limitations as claimed in claims 1 and 5. However, the
combination fails to disclose the adapter master station emits indication signals
to the communications unit, allowing it to be verified in the communications unit,
e.g. via sound emission, whether it may be coupled to the adapter master station,
and if so a prioritized connection to the adapter master station is provided.

Mooncy et al. disclose the adapter master station emits indication signals
to the communications unit, allowing it to be verified in the communications unit

(wireless BLUETOOTH phone 502 sends an unsolicited result code RING to alert the user of the BLUETOOTH headset 504 as disclosed in fig. 5 and further disclosed in paragraph 17), e.g. via sound emission, whether it may be coupled to the adapter master station, and if so a prioritized connection to the adapter master station is provided.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the adapter master station as disclosed by Cannon et al. and Liang to emit indication signals to the communications unit as disclosed by Mooney et al. One is motivated as such in order to provide the user to notice an incoming call even in the noisy environment.

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cannon et al. (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2002/0090912) in view of Liang (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2002/0071549) and further in view of Hahn et al. (WO 00/72555).

-Regarding claim 8, the combination of Cannon et al. and Liang discloses all the limitations as claimed in claims 1 and 5. However, the combination fails to disclose the adapter master station has a volume control unit to adjust the strength of a signal between the communications unit and a master station, e.g. a public switched telephone, relative to the strength of the signal between the headset and another master station, e.g. a mobile telephone.

Hahn et al. disclose the adapter master station has a volume control unit to adjust the strength of a signal between the communications unit and a master station, e.g. a public switched telephone, relative to the strength of the signal

between the headset and another master station, e.g. a mobile telephone (**page 7 lines 26-28**).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of invention to modify the adapter master station as disclosed by Cannon et al. and Liang to have a volume control unit as disclosed by Hahn et al. One is motivated as such in order to provide a uniform volume to prevent damage to the ears.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 5/30/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. In pages 4 and 5 of the remarks, regarding claim 1, applicant argues that there is no disclosure within Cannon et al. that indicates that the communication unit in addition to the well-known address fields 8 has a special address field 9 with an associated electrical lock, which is reserved so that only master stations having a special identification key are capable of addressing the address field 9. -The examiner respectfully disagrees. Cannon et al. indeed disclose the implementation of the PIN in a BLUETOOTH piconet device is to provide another level of security as disclosed in paragraph 59; and the device list can only store the received BD_ADDRs from other BLUETOOTH devices having matching PIN as disclosed in paragraph 43.

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 3 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PING Y. HSIEH whose telephone number is (571)270-3011. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (alternate Fridays) 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yuwen Pan can be reached on 571-272-7855. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. Y. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 2618

/Yuwen Pan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618